DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 130 EA 012 040

AUTHOR Katz, Stanley S.
TITLE Results-Oriented Supervision (for Teachers).
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the International Congress on Education (2nd, Vancouver, British Columbia, June 17-20, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; Program Development; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Results Oriented Supervision

ABSTRACT

Results-Oriented Supervision (R.O.S.) is a system for teacher supervision that focuses more on instructional improvement than on teacher evaluation. The supervisor and the teacher join together to formulate teaching objectives. After a period of implementation, a postconference is held to assess and restate or renew objectives. In the school system described here, implementation of R.O.S. began with teachers and administrators expressing a need for a better supervision system. A committee was formed to investigate supervision systems, and assistance was given by a supervision Task Force made up of central staff, department heads, and teachers. A principals' inservice subcommittee introduced the concept to principals. A coordinating committee implemented the program. After the program had functioned for several years, a review committee assessed the program through questionnaires and interviews. An outline of reactions, conclusions, and recommendations is included in the paper. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175130

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESULTS-ORIENTED SUPERVISION (FOR TEACHERS)

by

STANLEY S. KATZ

Chief Superintendent, Area Offices
Carleton Board of Education

Nepean (Ottawa), Ontario

EA 012 040

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Katz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

In an effort to humanize the supervisory undertaking, a climate for growth is a necessity in which supervision is viewed as a process and not simply as an inspection/report procedure. One definition of the "new" process: Results-Oriented Supervision (R.O.S.) is a cyclic process of growth modification which uses bilateral objective setting activity with prime emphasis on formative (rather than on summative) assessment. R.O.S. is a process of continuous operation in which there is gradual planned progress toward pre-determined objectives. R.O.S. strives to focus more upon instructional improvement than it does upon teacher evaluation. In this process, the role of the supervisor is to assist the teacher in a quasi-management style by facilitating and supporting him during the timeline set for achieving his goals. The process is cyclic. New objectives are set, met, discarded, achieved and reviewed in relation to information and experience, newly derived during the process. The supervisor and the person supervised both contribute to the process of formulating objectives. Whatever objective is set for the supervisee, becomes by implication, an objective as well for the supervisor. The actual method involves three phases: pre-conferencing to set objectives, implementation and monitoring, and post-conferencing to assess and restate or renew objectives. The outcome should produce a high quality of instruction by a secure and purposeful staff for the benefit and well-being of the students.

.../2

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

In 1973, two concurrent concerns developed. Central staff was becoming increasingly interested in improving procedure which could be used in evaluation and supervision of academic personnel. At the same time, the Teachers' Federation of Carleton expressed its growing awareness that a more positive aspect of supervision to aid in teacher growth was necessary. In response to these perceived needs, the Carleton Board of Education created the Director's Committee on Supervision of Academic Personnel on October 9, 1973. From November 1973, until its report in June 1975, this committee, comprised of members of central staff and the teachers' federations, investigated the practices of supervision in Carleton and elsewhere. The mandate of the committee was:

1. To make suggestions concerning possible revisions to the current supervisory procedures;
2. To make recommendations concerning criteria which may be used in the assessment of professional staff;
3. To make recommendations concerning the type of in-service activities which would be of maximum assistance for teachers and supervisory staff.

The committee received invaluable assistance from a Supervision Task Force (comprised of a member of central staff, department heads, and elementary and secondary teachers) that was formed to sample and record the attitudes and ideas about supervision that were prevalent in the field. During 1974, the group visited more than 50 schools in the system to ascertain the views of the academic staff with regard to supervision.

.../3

The final report of the Director's Committee was submitted to the Education Committee of the Board on June 5, 1975, and is a matter of record. The report contained a number of working papers and recommendations on topics of concern:

1. That a teacher's personal file should be open to his/her viewing;
2. That there be a third-party assessment procedure to be used in connection with supervision for documentation;
3. That there be a procedure for use in the selection of academic personnel for positions of responsibility;
4. That the evaluation form for Carleton teachers used to document a teacher's performance in a school be reviewed, modified or replaced;
5. That a statement of the criteria for good teaching be drafted to indicate basic role expectations;
6. That in-service be provided at all levels of supervision to acquaint the supervisor with the concepts and practices being proposed as positive supervision;
7. That results-oriented supervision be emphasized as the prime method of supervision in the system.

When the Director's Committee stood down in June 1975, the task of acting upon recommendations and responding to position papers was dispersed among various individuals and staff groups. The major responsibility, that of

../4

introducing the concept of supervision to the principals of Carleton, was assigned to a Principals' In-Service Sub-Committee. It was also at this time that the focus began to change from the general concept of positive supervision to the more specific practice known as Results-Oriented Supervision (R.O.S.).

On December 4, 1975, the Coordinating Committee, functioning under the chairmanship of the Superintendent of Operations, met for the first time. This committee and its four composite sub-committees guided the course of Results-Oriented Supervision until April 1977, when, due to various exigencies, the committee ceased to play an active role.

The Coordinating Committee accomplished the following:

1. Developed the report on the "Criteria for Good Teaching";
2. Established a Carleton Board of Education course in R.O.S.;
3. Offered in-service programs;
4. Produced and circulated information bulletins;
5. Conducted a preliminary evaluation on perceptions of progress in the area of supervision.

In the Spring of 1978, the Superintendents of Schools set as a major goal, a review of the status and direction of the positive supervision program. To this end, a committee comprised of two representatives from each of the Carleton Board of Education's three geographical areas (Eastern, Western and Central) plus a member of the central administrative

.../5

staff, was formed. This committee's terms of reference were as follows:

1. To review the actions and activities regarding positive supervision since 1976;
2. To obtain current input from teaching staff with respect to progress to date in R.O.S.;
3. To check the original target for training/workshops in positive supervision;
4. To re-establish/establish current needs and goals.

The committee began its deliberations in September 1978, and devoted many hours in meetings and investigations. Questionnaires were distributed to 612 elementary and secondary teachers, department heads, vice-principals and principals, out of a total of approximately 2,000 academic staff in the system. Individual interviews were conducted with 165 of the total academic staff.

Reactions of the Carleton system to Results-Oriented Supervision as well as a number of conclusions and recommendations with respect to R.O.S. are outlined on the following pages.

.../6

FORMATIVE SUPERVISION (R.O.S.)

Assumptions and Key Concepts:

1. People are growth oriented;
2. People are motivated by intrinsic rewards - achievement, satisfaction and accomplishment;
3. Supervision can be based on honesty and trust;
4. Primary purpose of supervision should be to improve, not prove;
5. Teachers' professional needs vary as do their competencies, i.e. the need for individualized in-service;
6. Individual teachers are capable of identifying areas for their own professional growth;
7. Emphasis should be on self-improvement and self-evaluation;
8. Success criteria should be determined by those affected - teachers;
9. Essence of monitoring by the supervisor should be coaching, not umpiring - cooperative process;
10. Improvement is achieved with the use of performance objectives and self-management - assess, plan, implement, evaluate instructional strategy.

COMPETENCE + RECOGNITION + INTEREST + DESIRE = HIGH PRODUCTIVITY

PRODUCTIVITY + GROWTH + CHANGE = QUALITY EDUCATION

.../7

REACTION OF THE CARLETON SYSTEM TO R.O.S.

Teachers:

Forty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they had identified a list of objectives, which, if met, were supposed to result in an improvement in job performance.

Ninety-five percent of the teachers who had participated in a process of setting objectives, attempting to meet them and evaluating progress in reaching them, found that the experience had improved their job performance.

Department Heads:

Fifty-five percent of the respondents felt that performance was somewhat improved and thirty percent reported that performance improved a little as a result of R.O.S.

Vice-Principals:

Eighty-five percent of those who responded cited R.O.S. as an acceptable procedure for improving instruction.

When asked to select the one best way in which they could most effectively help improve instruction in the school, the R.O.S. method was most frequently mentioned.

.../8

Vice-principals cited three main strengths:

1. The process puts a "healthy" pressure on staff;
2. The pupils are benefiting;
3. It enhances professional growth.

Principals:

Sixty-five percent of the principals who utilized the R.O.S. process felt that some improvement in job performance of staff was made. Twenty-five percent suggested that a little improvement resulted.

A majority of the principals felt that teachers were generally positive toward the process and would do it again if requested.

.../9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At present, a wide range of knowledge and adaptation of the R.O.S. process exists in Carleton. There seems to be greater enthusiasm and support for R.O.S. where principals and vice-principals have become familiar with the process. A wider use of R.O.S. has been made at the intermediate school level than at the high school level. The department heads are key personnel in the use of R.O.S. at the high school level.

According to the findings, however, supervision is taking place in Carleton in a number of instances. It is perceived as beneficial and non-threatening. It does lead to improved communication; it improves planning and it enhances professional growth. A program producing these benefits should be supported.

Several recommendations pinpoint the need for additional clarification of terms and procedures used in the R.O.S. process. The other major area of recommendations concerns the targeting of certain groups such as high school department heads for R.O.S. workshops.

The Carleton system has implemented R.O.S. without an apparent overuse of paper warfare. This practice should continue. A teacher's time should be spent in teaching and teacher-related activities such as planning, evaluation, marking, professional reading and workshops, guided by objective-setting procedures. A properly implemented R.O.S. procedure can facilitate the use of that time to add up to accrued benefits for students.

The general feeling is that Results-Oriented Supervision has been a worthwhile and successful project in Carleton.